REMARKS

The present application was filed on September 1, 2000, with claims 1-24. Claims 1-24 remain pending in the present application. Claims 1, 13 and 21 are the independent claims.

Claims 1-5, 7 and 21-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,580,460 (hereinafter "Takahashi").

Claims 6 and 12-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Takahashi.

Claims 8-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Takahashi in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,392,447 (hereinafter "Schlack").

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the application in view of the above amendments and the following remarks.

Applicants respectfully traverse the §102(e) and §103(a) rejections for the reasons set forth in their previous response, the contents of which are hereby incorporated herein by reference. As described in the previous response, Takahashi discloses an arrangement in which an accessory device receives power from a basic device based on a determination by the accessory device as to whether the basic device is capable of supplying sufficient power.

Notwithstanding the traversal, Applicants have amended independent claims 1, 13 and 21 to clarify the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention.

Claim 1 has been amended to clarify that the control signal received from the basic device triggers a transition of the accessory device from a powered-off state in which the power supply unit is deactivated to a powered-on state in which the power supply unit is activated. The claim as amended further indicates that the control signal is indicative of whether or not an application which requires use of the accessory device is currently running on the basic device. Support for the amendment can be found in the specification at, for example, page 5, lines 1-25.

The Examiner in formulating the §102(e) rejection of claim 1 over Takahashi argues that the power supply unit of claim 1 is met by the power management unit 108 in image sensing device 117 of FIG. 1, and that the control signal

of claim 1 is a signal indicating whether the power supply capacity from printer 118 is large enough or is not large enough to supply power to the image sensing device 117. However, the claim in question, even prior to the foregoing amendment, indicated that the control signal was received from the basic device. The signal referenced by the Examiner, namely a signal indicating whether the power supply capacity from printer 118 is or is not large enough, is not supplied to image sensing device 117 from printer 118. Instead, the determination as to whether the power supply capacity from printer 118 is or is not large enough to supply power to the image sensing device 117 is made using a power detection unit 202 within the power management unit 108 of image sensing device 117, as shown in FIG. 2 and described in column 3, lines 44-53. Thus, the signal which the Examiner alleges is anticipatory of the control signal of claim 1 is apparently not received from a basic device, as would be required by the claim.

Moreover, there is no control signal received in image sensing device 117 from the printer 118 in Takahashi which triggers a transition of the image sensing device 117 from a powered-off state in which a power supply unit of the image sensing device 117 is deactivated to a powered-on state in which the power supply unit of the image sensing device 117 is activated. Instead, Takahashi in column 13, lines 1-20, clearly indicates that the image sensing device 117 must be in a powered-on state in order to determine if the power supplied from printer 118 is sufficient to operate the image sensing device 117. Since the power management unit 108 makes this determination itself, as indicated above, that unit certainly must be activated and operational prior to the determination.

Furthermore, there is no control signal received in image sensing device 117 from printer 118 in Takahashi which triggers the above-described transition, and is also indicative of whether or not an application which requires use of the image sensing device 117 is currently running on the printer 118. Thus, Takahashi fails to provide the power conserving advantages of the claimed invention, such as those outlined in the context of an illustrative embodiment at page 5, lines 26-28, of the specification.

Independent claims 13 and 21 have also been amended to clarify that a control signal received in an accessory device triggers a transition of the accessory device from a powered-off state in which a power supply unit is deactivated to a

powered-on state in which the power supply unit is activated. As indicated previously, the signal relied on by the Examiner is actually generated in the image sensing device 117, and in any event does not trigger a transition of the type recited in the claims as amended.

Applicants respectfully submit that the amendments proposed herein are responsive to the comments first provided by the Examiner at pages 2-3 of the final Office Action, and accordingly should be entered. The proposed amendments are not believed to raise any new issues, and in any event place the application in better form for consideration on appeal.

It is believed that the claims in the application are allowable over the prior art and such allowance is respectfully requested.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees in connection with this communication to Eastman Kodak Company Deposit Account No. 05-0225. ***A duplicate copy of this communication is enclosed.***

Respectfully submitted,

Pamela R. Crocker

Pamela R. Crocker
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Registration No. 42,447

PRC:cjm
Telephone: (585) 477-0553
Facsimile: (585) 477-4646